

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending in this application, of which claims 39-49 are withdrawn. Claims 1-38 are rejected. Claims 14, 26 and 29 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The specification is currently amended as requested. In particular, missing information has been provided in the cross-reference to related applications.

With regard to the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101, applicant respectfully declines the invitation to amend the claims to recite a computer-storage medium rather than a computer-readable medium. Applicant prefers to use the terminology used in the MPEP and various case law with reference to computer related inventions.

Although claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, 29 and 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,681,232 (Sistanizadeh) in view of US Patent No. 7,133,403 (Mo), and claims 2, 15, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sistanizadeh, in view of Mo and further in view of Levandovsky, the examiner indicated¹ that the independent claims would be allowed if amended to contain either the limitations of claim 2 or the last limitation in claim 1. Claims 14, 26 and 29 are currently amended to recite the last limitation of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore requested.

In the response to arguments beginning at page 11 of the Office Action the examiner states that “a careful read of Sistanizadeh clearly states that the information provided to the customers by the interface the health information of the network ... although it understands the network topology, the SLM does not explicitly expose or “leak” the topology to the users.” In

¹ Applicant has no record of the phone calls described in the interview summary

other words, the foundation of the response to applicant's arguments is that the SLM of Sistanizadeh does not provide the topology information to the users as a standard function. It is respectfully suggested that the network topology and other sensitive information, which is described² in Sistanizadeh as being in a database on customer equipment, would be so vulnerable to personnel of even modest technical ability that the alleged distinction lacks merit. Applicant's point is that storing the information in an unprotected database inside customer equipment is at best only marginally more secure than exporting the data as a program function. Consequently, Sistanizadeh does "expose" the information. In contrast, the claims recite that the information is stored on a network device rather than a customer device. Applicant therefore respectfully disagrees with the examiner.

Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

/January 29, 2010/
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP
33 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(603) 854-0332

Docket No. 120-174
Dd: 01/29/2010

² Sistanizadeh at column 17, line 62 through column 19, line 35